

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/696,568	10/30/2003	Yuji Sugimoto	03-038 5919		
23400 7	7590 01/11/2006		EXAM	INER	
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC 12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE SUITE 101 RESTON, VA 20191			LIEU, JULIE	LIEU, JULIE BICHNGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2636		
			DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summer	10/696,568	SUGIMOTO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Julie Lieu	2636				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 October 2005</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
·						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/696,568

Art Unit: 2636

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's request for consideration filed October

25, 2005. No claims have been amended, canceled, or added.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-A-8-

216735 (cited by the applicant).

<u>Claims 1-7:</u>

The vehicle meter unit disclosed in the JP'735 patent meets all the claimed limitation of claims 1-7, except the location of the radio receiver. Nonetheless, the shift of location of part to achieve an optimal result would not be considered an inventive step because it is within the knowledge of a skilled artisan to improve a radio frequency system by reducing or eliminating noise to achieve the desired result.

Applicant's arguments

Art Unit: 2636

4. Applicant has argued that Examiner provided improper reason for rejection. Applicant has asserted that Examiner merely presented a statement of the level of skill in the art but failed to point out any specific teaching or suggestion for making this modification. The applicant has stated that the level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. Applicant further has contended that Examiner used hindsight since there is no suggestion or motivation found in the prior art references.

Response to Applicant's arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is submitted that the concept of mounting a RF circuitry of an RF receiver/transmitter on the opposite side of a circuit board to avoid interference between the high frequency signal device such as a digital signal processing circuitry which uses high frequency clock signal and the RF circuit is very old and conventional in the art. This is evidenced in the Pressler et al. patent, provided herein for Applicant's reference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to mount the radio receiver of JP'735 on the opposite the circuit board for the same reason which is well known.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion or motivation found and that Examiner use hindsight in the rejection, the examiner submits that motivation for combining prior art references not need be explicitly found in the references themselves, and the examiner may provide explanation based on logic and sound reasoning that will support a holding of obviousness. (Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ2d, 1300). In this case the attached patent to

Pressler et al. provides the evidence that the concept of reducing interference of a high frequency signal device on a radio device by mounting the two devices on opposite sides of the same circuit is very old and well known and it is within the knowledge of a skilled artisan to do the same in JP'735.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

For the above reason the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2636

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julie Lieu whose telephone number is 571-272-2978. The examiner can normally be reached on MaxiFlex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Julie Lieu

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2636

Jan. 06, 06